

Commentary

Discussion of Time and Tide: analysis of sea level time series

ABSTRACT

The recognition of the non-accelerating, periodic pattern of sea levels as described by the tide gauges measurements does not require any special mathematical tool. If the classical linear fitting is used to compute the rate of rise at any time, the acceleration is then simply the time rate of change of this velocity. The lack of any acceleration over the last 20 years is evident in the naturally oscillating, slow rising, tide gauges of enough quality and length. The accuracy in the computation of the periodicities of the natural oscillations does not impact at all on this result, as conversely the commented paper wrongly suggests.

Keywords: Sea level rise, sea level acceleration, sea level oscillations, computations, experiments

1. INTRODUCTION

Analyses of the sea levels recorded by the tide gauges have shown that contrary to the IPCC claim, there has been no sign of carbon dioxide driven acceleration since the 1950. The sea levels are mostly oscillating, on average slow rising with a rate close to the subsidence rate of the tide gauge, and absolutely not accelerating over the last few decades (Parker, 2013; Parker, 2014; Carter et al, 2014).

According to Foster & Brown (2014), the papers that have examined sea level data to estimate the pattern of acceleration and deceleration proposing cyclic or quasi-periodic variations “contain technical problems which call their results into question”. In this way, the authors try to make unclear what is otherwise very evident, defocusing the debate from the striding differences from the pattern predicted by the IPCC climate models and the actual measurements at the tide gauges.

The existence of natural, multi-decadal oscillations up to a quasi-60 years is a very well-known feature of sea levels. As evidenced by Carter et al, 2014, all the climate-related phenomena, including the sea-level, change through time in a non-stationary way, and exhibit repetitive (though not exactly regular) patterns of behavior decadal and multi-decadal periods. Changes in the rate of global sea-level are, for example, known to be influenced by a 50-60 year rhythm related to oceanic internal variability e.g., Pacific Decadal Oscillation, PDO; Atlantic Meridional Oscillation, AMO (e.g. Holgate, 2007; Chambers, Merrifield & Nerem, 2012; Marcos, Tsimplis & Calafat, 2012; Soon & Legates, 2013; Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson, 2013). Long period tidal constituents (the 18.6 lunar nodal cycle, for example) also exert an influence on sea-level height (e.g. Pugh, 2004; Yndestad, Turrell & Ozhigin, 2008). Morner (2013) discusses the influence of the Helios sphere and the Earth magnetosphere on the climate on Earth. The solar-planetary beat has a 60-years cycle. The Earth's rate of rotation has a 60-years Length of Day (the standard method to measure the

Earth's rate of rotation) cycle. The Global temperature has a 60 years cycle. The North Atlantic circulation has a 60 years cycle. The 60-years cycle recorded in solar activity and earth rotation affect the oceanic circulation, the temperatures and the sea levels.

While the existence of multi-decadal oscillations is very difficult to be negated, the autocorrelation issue raised by Foster & Brown (2014) does not put in question the existence of the natural fluctuations but at the most the accuracy of the computation of the amplitudes, phases and periodicities of the oscillations. As a matter of fact, the most part of the work on the multi-decadal periodicities claim the existence of quasi-20 or quasi-60 year's periodicities, and not certainly of perfectly sinusoidal oscillations of time periods computed within an accuracy of the nanoseconds. It is shown with a simple methodology as the sea levels are not accelerating and the issues raised by Foster & Brown (2014) are irrelevant.

2. METHODOLOGY

Many tide gauges are recording the relative sea levels since the 1800s and the early 1900s in coastal locations worldwide and the linear analysis of the monthly average values has been historically the method of determining the relative rate of rise (Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson, 2013). Because of the quasi-60 years oscillations, Carter et al (2014) conclude that sea-level records longer than 60 years, and even better longer than 120 years, are required to identify any long-term trends that might, or might not, occur in the data. Considering not too many tide gauges are measuring sea levels since more than 120 years ago without any quality issues, Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson (2013) and Parker (2014) suggest using tide gauge signals continuously covering more than 60 years without many gaps and without any perturbing event as the relocation or substitution of the tide gauge.

The assessment of the presence (or absence) in the tide gauge records of enough length and quality of any acceleration induced by the anthropogenic carbon dioxide emission claimed by the climate model is then very simple. The simple mathematics has been proposed in many papers as Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson (2013) and it is reproduced below.

The relative rate of rise SLR is computed through the linear fitting applied to the distribution of measured points $\{x_i, y_i\}$ $i=1, \dots, n$ where y_i is the monthly average relative mean sea level at the time x_i . The relative rate $SLR_{j,k}$ is computed over the time window (x_k-x_j) by linearly fitting the data $\{x_i, y_i\}$ $i=j, \dots, k$ through the formula:

$$SLR_{j,k} = \frac{\sum_{i=j}^k (x_i - \bar{x}) \cdot (y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=j}^k (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are the sample means.

If $j=1$ (the oldest record) and $k=n$ (the latest record), then $SLR_{1,n}$ is the latest estimation of the relative rate of rise at the time x_n .

If j is variable and $k=n$, then $SLR_{i,n}$ is the present velocity for different time windows x_n-x_i , simulating the effect of the tide gauge recording started at different times x_i rather than x_1 (Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson, 2013; Parker, 2014a).

If $j=1$ (the oldest record) and k is variable, then $SLR_{1,k}$ is the estimation of the relative rate of rise at the time x_k .

From Equation (1) with $j=1$ and k variable it is possible to compute the acceleration:

$$SLA_k = \frac{SLR_{1,k} - SLR_{1,k-1}}{x_k - x_{k-1}} \quad (2)$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Application of equation (1) and equation (2) to a proper data set is enough to confute all the sea level accelerating claims without any need of hypothetically more sophisticated measurement and analysis tools only contributing to make more confused a worldwide sea level pattern that is otherwise very clear.

The surveys of relative sea level rates of rise global or local by many organizations as PSMSL (or NOAA) may be used to evaluate the acceleration by using the relative sea level rates of rise computed for the same tide gauge at two different times.

As also reported elsewhere, the latest PSMSL "Table of Relative Mean Sea Level Secular Trends derived from PSMSL RLR Data" update 14-Feb-2014 (www.psmsl.org) proposes the relative rates of rise computed for 560 tide gauges of variable record length (maximum 183, minimum 21, average 56.5 years) with the more recent, shortest tide gauges collected mostly in areas of subsidence and a strongly non-uniform geographical coverage.

The use in different times of different populations of tide gauges of different length, different rates of subsidence or uplift, and different parameters of the oscillations is what permits the false claim the sea level have been accelerating over the last decades by cherry picking when actually all the long term tide gauges of the world have been on average acceleration free.

The average relative rate of rise of the 560 tide gauges is 1.04 ± 0.45 mm/year, but this number has very little significance. By only using the 170 tide gauges of PSMSL having length more than 60 years at the present time, the average relative rate of rise is 0.25 ± 0.19 mm/year. If we want to study the changes in the rate of rise of sea levels over the satellite altimeter era, we do not have to consider the 100 tide gauges of PSMSL having length more than 80 years at the present time are 100, i.e. more than 60 years of length 20 years ago, and the average rate of rise for them is 0.24 ± 0.15 mm/year. For these tide gauges, the rate of rise has been moving up and down over the last 20 years without any sign of globally positive or negative accelerations.

In additions of being acceleration free, these tide gauges are on average more subjected to subsidence than uplift, as suggested by the nearby GPS dome velocities by SONEL (www.sonel.org). Therefore the worldwide tide gauge signals suggest slow rising seas without any acceleration and with a significant component of subsidence.

The result of this synthetic analysis may be complemented by the analysis through equations (1) and (2) of the long term sea level time series. All the long term tide gauges exhibit pretty much the same pattern. Therefore, we select here the Sydney and San Diego tide gauges, on the west and east shores of the Pacific, in the southern and northern hemisphere.

Figures 1 and 2 present the mean sea level measured in Sydney and San Diego, plus the results obtained by replacing the measured data with a fitting with a line and multiple sines (Parker, Saad Saleem & Lawson 2013; Parker 2014). This fitting with a line and sines has the expression:

$$y^*(x) = (A^* + SLR^* \cdot x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[A_i \cdot \sin \left(\pi \cdot \frac{x - x_{c,i}}{w_i} \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

where y^* is the fitted relative sea level and the time x , SLR^* is the relative rate of rise and A^* is the intercept, while A_i , $x_{c,i}$, w_i are the amplitudes, phases and periods of the oscillations permits to study the effect of the natural oscillations. Equation (1) and (2) are applied to both time series to show what natural oscillation is and what is noise. The figures also present the vertical position and the subsidence rate of inland GPS domes nearby the tide gauges. Application of equation (1) and (2) to the perfectly oscillating zero acceleration time series may return positive or negative accelerations depending on the time window.

In Figure 1a is the classic trend computation (from tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/). The standard error or the 95% confidence interval is only a measure of the linear fitting error. The “true” relative rate of rise is not the computed value $\pm$ the standard error or the 95% confidence interval. With short and incomplete records the computed value may be very far from the legitimate value. Other measurement issues, including variable subsidence at the tide gauge or relocation of the tide gauge or inaccurate levelling, may also bias the result.

In Figure 1 b are the measured monthly averaged mean sea levels and the fitted values from equation (3). The 36 months moving averaged are superimposed. The perfectly not accelerating model reproduces quite well the experimental evidence even if the experimental evidence is much more complex and the noise of the measurement is significant.

In Figure 1 c are the same monthly averaged mean sea levels of figure b but de trended, i.e. the monthly values minus their linear trend values.

In Figure 1 d is the SLR computed from the measured and the fitted data over the last 20 years. Over the time window 1993 to present, the measured SLR of Sydney is slightly increasing since 1999, while the measured SLR of San Diego is slightly decreasing since same year. Before that time, the trend was inverted, as a result of oscillations that are not in phase. Same pattern is shown by the fully periodical fitting. This is the only result of interest to assess the effect of global warming, and clearly having a more or less accurate model (3) has no impact on the conclusion.

In Figure 1e is the present SLR computed from the measured and the fitted data by using different record length. Unfortunately, the long tide gauges records having more than 100 years of data are not too many, and in many cases SLR are computed by using short record lengths. With short record lengths the computed SLR differ considerably from the legitimate long term SLR. The measured 20 years SLR for Sydney is more than 5 times the correct value, while the measured 20 years SLR of San Diego is more than 10 times smaller.




Fig. 1. Measured and fitted sea level patterns in Sydney.

a) classic trend computation (from tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/). Relative sea level velocity is $+0.65 \pm 0.10$ mm/year; b) measured and fitted (equation (3)) monthly average mean sea levels; c) detrended monthly average mean sea levels; d) SLR over the last 20 years; e) present SLR by using different record lengths; f) GPS velocity nearby the tide gauge (from www.sonel.org). Subsidence velocity is -0.89 ± 0.65 mm/year.




Fig. 2. Measured and fitted sea level patterns in San Diego.

a) classic trend computation (from tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/). Relative sea level velocity is $+2.06 \pm 0.23$ mm/year; b) measured and fitted (equation (3)) monthly average mean sea levels; c) detrended monthly average mean sea levels; d) SLR over the last 20 years; e) present SLR by using different record lengths; f) GPS velocity nearby the tide gauge (from www.sonel.org). Subsidence velocity of nearby domes are -1.65 ± 0.41 mm/year (Point Loma 3, PLO3) and -3.23 ± 0.17 mm/year (Point Loma 5, PLO5).

Even if many papers have wrongly claimed the hot spot of positive but never the cold spot of negative acceleration, this conclusion is only the result of cherry picking the information between a valley and a peak of an oscillation rather than between a peak and a valley. The pattern proposed in Figure 2 e is only the result of the periodicities, amplitudes, phases of the oscillations and the time window. Same pattern is shown by the not accelerating fitting.

In Figure 2 f is the subsidence trend of GPS domes nearby the tide gauges (from www.sonel.org). This unfortunately not very accurate result suggests a subsidence rate very close to the relative rate of rise of sea levels for both Sydney and San Diego for a close to zero absolute rate of rise in both locations. The vertical velocity of the Sydney SYDN GPS dome is -0.89 ± 0.65 mm/year. Subsidence velocity of GPS domes nearby the San Diego tide gauge are -1.65 ± 0.41 mm/year (Point Loma 3, PLO3) and -3.23 ± 0.17 mm/year (Point Loma 5, PLO5).

The issue raised by Foster & Brown (2014) does not have any effect on the above conclusions.

The oscillations of sea levels are not certainly perfectly sinusoidal and the sea level forcings are certainly many. Clearly, by using different periodic functions that are not exactly sinusoidal and by increasing the number of functions adopted for a fitting like (3), the determination of the periodicities of the oscillations may certainly provide slightly different results. However, this is irrelevant in the optic of the debate on the presence or absence of acceleration in the sea levels.

The liner and sinusoidal models, equation (1) and equation (3) respectively, can be fit by using least squares routines. To obtain a good fit for the sinusoidal (nonlinear) model, least squares routines may require good starting values for the constant, the amplitude, and the periodicity and different approaches may provide slightly different results. This has however no appreciable influence on the sea level rise result. As with any statistical model, the fit is subjected to graphical and quantitative techniques of model validation up to satisfactory accuracy.

4. CONCLUSION

In view of the only $+0.25$ mm/year of the present relative rate of rise at the acceleration free worldwide average tide gauge by classic, simple methods, with an overwhelming contribution by subsidence, there is no reason to question how accurate may be the estimation of the multi-decadal periodicities to void the assessment of the velocity and acceleration of sea levels very far from the climate model predictions.

If the sea levels have to rise of 1 meter by 2100 and not of only 21.5 millimeters at the worldwide average tide gauge, there is a problem of orders of magnitude difference in the sea levels computed (by climate models) and measured (by tide gauges). Discussing the nano meter per year (in the rate of rise) or the nano second (in the periodicity of the oscillations) to hide the two orders of magnitude difference in between projected and measured sea level rises is not a good service to science.

REFERENCES

1. Carter R M, de Lange W, Hansen J M, Humlum O, Idso C, Kear D, Legates D, Mörner N A, Ollier C, Singer F & Soon W. Commentary and Analysis on the Whitehead & Associates 2014 NSW Sea-Level Report, NIPCC Report Reference: E13.7268, 2014.

2. Chambers D P, Merrifield M A and Nerem R S. Is there a 60-year oscillation in global mean sea level?, *Geophysical Research Letters* 2012, 39(18): L18607. doi: 10.1029/2012GL052885.
3. Foster G & Brown P T. Time and Tide: Analysis of Sea Level Time Series. *Climate Dynamics*, 2014: in press. doi:10.1007/s00382-014-2224-3
4. Holgate, S. On the decadal rates of sea level change during the twentieth century, *Geophysical Research Letters* 2007, 34: L01602. Doi:10.1029/2006GL028492.
5. Marcos M, Tsimplis M N & Calafat F M, Inter-annual and decadal sea level variations in the north-western Pacific marginal seas. *Progress In Oceanography* 2012 105: 4–21.
6. Mörrner N. Solar Wind, Earth's Rotation and Changes in Terrestrial Climate. *Physical Review & Research International* 2013, 3(2):117-136.
7. Parker A, Saad Saleem M & Lawson M, Sea-Level Trend Analysis for Coastal Management, *Ocean & Coastal Management* 2013, 73:63–81. 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.12.005.
8. Parker, A. "MINIMUM 60 YEARS OF RECORDING ARE NEEDED TO COMPUTE THE SEA LEVEL RATE OF RISE IN THE WESTERN SOUTH PACIFIC", *Nonlinear Engineering*. 2014 (in press) Doi 10.1515/nleng-2013-0011.
9. Pugh, D. *Changing sea levels: Effects of tides, weather and climate*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004.
10. Soon W & Legates D R. Solar irradiance modulation of Equator-to-Pole (Arctic) temperature gradients: empirical evidence for climate variation on multi-decadal timescales, *Journal of Atmospheric, Solar & Terrestrial Physics* 2013, 93:45–56
11. Yndestad H, Turrell W R & Ozhigin V. Lunar nodal tide effects on variability of sea level, temperature, and salinity in the Faroe-Shetland Channel and the Barents Sea, *Deep Sea Research I* 2004, 55:1201–1217.